

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

TIMOTHY WADE JONES,

Civil File No. 06-4926 (DSD/JSM)

Plaintiff,

v.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

BUREAU OF PRISONS,  
HAZELTON PRISON,  
REGIONAL DIRECTORS OFFICE,  
BOP DC OFFICE, and  
MPLS, MN DIVISION, MARSHAL'S  
OFFICE,

Defendants.

---

This matter is before the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge on Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ("IFP"), as permitted by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). (Docket No. 2.) The matter has been referred to this Court for report and recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Rule 72.1. For the reasons discussed below, it is recommended that Plaintiff's IFP application be denied, and that the action be dismissed without prejudice.

Plaintiff, a federal prison inmate, commenced this action on December 18, 2006, by filing a complaint seeking relief for alleged violations of his federal constitutional rights. (Docket No. 1.) He did not pay the \$350 filing fee prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a), but instead submitted the application for IFP status that is now before the Court.

Because Plaintiff is a prisoner, his IFP application is subject to the requirements of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, ("PLRA"). This means, inter alia, that he must pay an initial partial filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1).

In this case, Plaintiff's initial partial filing fee, under the formula set forth at § 1915(b)(1), is \$13.52. However, Plaintiff did not tender his statutorily required initial partial filing fee with his complaint and IFP application. Therefore, by order dated December 20, 2006, (Docket No. 5), Plaintiff was directed to tender the required partial fee payment of \$13.52 within twenty days. The Court's order expressly advised Plaintiff that if he failed to pay the prescribed amount within the time allowed, he would be deemed to have abandoned this action, and it would be recommended that his case be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), for failure to prosecute.

The deadline by which Plaintiff was required to pay his initial partial filing fee has now passed, and Plaintiff has not tendered the payment due, nor has he offered any excuse for his failure to do so. Indeed, Plaintiff has not communicated with the Court at all since he filed his complaint. Therefore, in accordance with the Court's prior order of December 20, 2006, it is now recommended that Plaintiff be deemed to have abandoned this action, and that the action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). See also In re Smith, 114 F.3d 1247, 1251 (D.C.Cir. 1997) (failure to pay initial partial filing fee required by § 1915(b)(1) "may result in dismissal of a prisoner's action"); Amick v. Ashlock, No. 04-1171 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004), 2004 WL 2603590 (unpublished opinion) (prisoner lawsuit can properly be dismissed where prisoner fails to pay initial partial filing fee as ordered); Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (recognizing that a federal court has the inherent authority to "manage [its] own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases").

Having determined that this action should be summarily dismissed due to abandonment, the Court will further recommend that Plaintiff's pending IFP application,

(Docket No. 2), and motion for preliminary injunction, (Docket No. 3), be summarily denied.

Based upon the above, and upon all the records and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

1. Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, (Docket No. 2), be **DENIED**;
2. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction, (Docket No. 3), be **DENIED**; and
3. This action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated: January 24, 2007

*s/ Janie S. Mayeron*

JANIE S. MAYERON  
United States Magistrate Judge

Under D.Minn. LR 72.2(b) any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court, and serving all parties by **February 12, 2007**, a writing which specifically identifies those portions of this Report to which objections are made and the basis of those objections. Failure to comply with this procedure may operate as a forfeiture of the objecting party's right to seek review in the Court of Appeals. A party may respond to the objecting party's brief within ten days after service thereof. All briefs filed under this rule shall be limited to 3500 words. A judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions to which objection is made. This Report and Recommendation does not constitute an order or judgment of the District Court, and it is therefore not appealable directly to the Circuit Court of Appeals.